

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

JOSEPH MORGAN, )  
Petitioner, )  
v. ) CIVIL ACTION NO.  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ] 2:19-CV-675-ALB  
Respondent. ) [WO]

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

On September 12, 2019, Joseph Morgan (“Morgan”), a federal inmate at the Maxwell Federal Prison Camp, filed this *pro se* petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.<sup>1</sup> Doc. # 1. Morgan challenges the validity of convictions imposed against him in 2015 by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida for controlled substance offenses in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841 and firearm possession in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922. Morgan claims the trial court lacked jurisdiction over his criminal case because it had no authorization under Article III to hear his case. *Id.* at 2. In support of this claim, Morgan alleges he has been injured and that his “injury is ongoing due to an illegal detention order . . . void of Article III judicial powers extended from the United States Constitution [, and] [a]ny order issued without federal judicial authority is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Morgan originally filed the petition in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The appellate court transferred the petition to this court under Fed.R.App.P. 22(a), which provides that “[a]n application for a writ of habeas corpus must be made to the appropriate district court. If made to a circuit judge, the application must be transferred to the appropriate district court.”

VOID judgment and cannot be enforced.” *Id.* at 3. According to Morgan, his incarceration is unlawful because his conviction “is based on a plea of guilt which could not be lawfully accepted by the originating court” where the government lacked standing and that “[a]ny conviction underlying such a judgment is VOID and cannot be a legal basis for [his] detention order.” *Id.* at 4.

For the reasons that follow, the undersigned finds that this action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Morgan’s court of conviction.

## **II. DISCUSSION**

Federal courts have “an obligation to look behind the label of a motion filed by a *pro se* inmate and determine whether the motion is, in effect, cognizable under a different remedial statutory framework.” *United States v. Jordan*, 915 F.2d 622, 624–25 (11th Cir. 1990). Although brought as a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, this court must consider whether this action is properly styled as such, or if it is more appropriately considered as a motion to vacate under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

Section 2241 provides an avenue for challenges to matters such as the administration of parole, prison disciplinary actions, prison transfers, and certain types of detention. *See, e.g., Antonelli v. Warden, U.S.P. Atlanta*, 542 F.3d 1348, 1351–52 (11th Cir. 2008) (petition challenging decision of federal Parole Commission is properly brought under § 2241); *Bishop v. Reno*, 210 F.3d 1295, 1304 n.14 (11th Cir. 2000) (petition challenging Bureau of Prisons’ administration of service credits, including calculation, awarding, and withholding, involves execution rather than imposition of sentence, and thus

is a matter for habeas corpus). For purposes of venue, petitions filed under § 2241 must be brought in the district in which the petitioner is incarcerated. *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 442–43 (2004).

In contrast, 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a) states:

A prisoner in custody under sentence of a court established by an Act of Congress claiming the right to be released upon the ground that the sentence was imposed in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or that the court was without jurisdiction to impose such sentence, or that the sentence was in excess of the maximum authorized by law, or is otherwise subject to collateral attack, *may move the court which imposed the sentence* to vacate, set aside or correct the sentence.

28 U.S.C. § 2255(a) (emphasis added). For actions properly considered under § 2255, venue and jurisdiction lie only in the district of conviction. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a).

Morgan’s self-described § 2241 petition challenges the legality of his conviction and sentence. Generally, a federal prisoner must bring any collateral attack on the legality of his conviction or sentence through a motion to vacate under § 2255 rather than a petition for writ of habeas corpus under § 2241. *See McCarthan v. Dir. of Goodwill Indus.-Suncoast, Inc.*, 851 F.3d 1076, 1081 (11th Cir. 2017); *Venta v. Warden, FCC Coleman-Low*, 2017 WL 4280936, at \*1 (11th Cir. 2017). A petitioner challenging the legality of his federal detention may do so under § 2241 *only* if he shows that § 2255 would be an “inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention.” *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(e) (the so called “saving clause”); *see also Johnson v. Warden*, 737 F. App’x 989, 990–91 (11th Cir. 2018). Morgan does not attempt to show that § 2255 would be an inadequate vehicle to present his claims. Indeed he cannot, because his claims challenging the validity of his conviction and sentence fall squarely within the realm of injuries § 2255 addresses.

When a federal prisoner brings “a traditional claim attacking his [conviction or] sentence that he could have brought in a [§ 2255] motion to vacate, the remedy by [such] motion is adequate and effective to test the legality of his detention. . . . Allowing a prisoner with a claim that is cognizable in a [§ 2255] motion to vacate to access [§ 2241] nullifies the procedural hurdles of section 2255 and undermines the venue provisions.” *McCarthan*, 851 F.3d at 1090. Here, regardless of the label Morgan places on his pleadings, his petition challenging his conviction and sentence must be considered as a motion under § 2255, rather than § 2241. Section 2255 remains Morgan’s exclusive remedy to bring his challenge to his conviction and sentence.<sup>2</sup> Because he challenges a judgment entered in the Northern District of Florida, jurisdiction to consider the § 2255 motion lies only in the Northern District of Florida as the district of conviction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1631, a court that finds it lacks jurisdiction to entertain a civil action may, if it is in the interest of justice, transfer such action to any other court in which the action could have been brought when it was filed. Because Morgan is proceeding *pro se*, in the interest of justice this action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida.

---

<sup>2</sup> In an order entered on September 18, 2019 (Doc. # 2), this court informed Morgan that the claims in his self-styled § 2241 habeas petition were properly presented in a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. In accordance with *Castro v. United States*, 540 U.S. 375 (2003), the court notified Morgan of its intention to treat his petition as a § 2255 motion, which would be subject to any procedural limitations for § 2255 motions, and directed him to advise the court whether he wished to proceed on his claims under § 2255, to amend his construed § 2255 motion to assert additional claims under § 2255, or to withdraw his construed § 2255 motion. This court’s “Castro Order” also advised Morgan that if he failed to file a response in compliance with the order’s directives, the case would proceed as an action under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, with the court considering only those claims in the construed § 2255 motion. Morgan failed to file a response complying with the Castro Order’s directives, but instead filed documents in which he continued to insist he is entitled to pursue this action in this court under § 2241. *See* Docs. # 3 & 4.

### III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida under 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

It is further

ORDERED that the parties shall file any objections to this Recommendation on or before November 12, 2019. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982); 11TH CIR. R. 3-1. See *Stein v. Lanning Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). See also *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

DONE this 28th day of October, 2019.

/s/ Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE